



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/424,116	01/06/2000	GERARD LANG	05725.0489	7571

7590 07/31/2002

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW
GARRETT & DUNNER
1300 I STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

EINSMANN, MARGARET V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1751

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2002

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FD

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/424,116	LANG ET AL.
	Examiner Margaret Einsmann	Art Unit 1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2002.
 - 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 - 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
- Disposition of Claims**
- 4) Claim(s) 26-60 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 - 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 - 6) Claim(s) 26-60 is/are rejected.
 - 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 - 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the appeal brief filed 5/3/2002. The finality of the office action of 5/08/01 is withdrawn due to a new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's filing of a terminal disclaimed has mooted the obviousness double patenting rejection over 09/424,119 as applied in the previous actions.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 26-36, 40-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Konrad.

Lang, U.S. Patent No. 4,025,301, teaches compositions for dyeing hair which contain at least one cationic dye of the formula exemplified which encompasses dyes of formula (I) as claimed, wherein the dye is present in the claimed amounts at the claimed pH's in mediums as claimed, see Abstract and col. 2, lines 2-13. The patentee teaches that the compositions may also contain oxidation dyes, and may be mixed with hydrogen peroxide before application to the hair as claimed, see col. 3, lines 42-51. Lang exemplifies various 3-aminopyridine dyes as claimed, see Examples such as 8-15, 20-24 and 27-29. In Example q, Lang exemplifies a composition which contains the dye of Example 14 (a dye of formula (I) as claimed), oxidation bases including p-toluenediamine, p-aminophenol and N-methyl-p-aminophenol sulfate, and couplers including m-aminophenol, all in the claimed amounts in a medium as claimed. The composition is mixed with a hydrogen peroxide oxidant, and is applied to hair in a dyeing method as claimed. Lang does not teach the claimed couplers of formula (I), or the claimed kits.

Konrad, U.S. Patent No. 4,588,410, teaches compositions for dyeing hair which contain a coupler-of-formula-(I), which encompasses couplers-of-formula-(II) as claimed, see Abstract. Konrad teaches that such couplers, particularly the claimed (2'-hydroxyethoxy)-2-hydroxy-4-aminobenzene, is an improvement over the conventionally used m-aminophenol coupler because it results in more fashionable

tones when combined with conventional developers such as p-aminophenols and p-diamines, see col. 2, line 24-col. 3, line 12.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to at least partially substitute the m-aminophenol coupler in the compositions and processes of Lang (which use oxidation bases and direct dyes of formula (I) as claimed), resulting in dyeing compositions and processes as claimed, because Lang does not require any specific oxidation dyes for use in the patentee's compositions, and Konrad teaches that the claimed substituted m-aminophenols have various improvements over the conventionally used m-aminophenol such as improved tones when combined with conventional oxidation bases, including the bases exemplified by Lang. The storage of the compositions of Lang as modified by Konrad in kits as claimed would have been obvious to those skilled in the art because such kits are conventional for the storage of two-part oxidative hair dyeing compositions, absent a showing otherwise.

Examiner notes the comparative Examples in the specification which show that two compositions as claimed have increased color uptake as compared to two compositions which differ only in that they contain m-aminophenol as coupler instead of 5-amino-2-methylphenol as claimed. This evidence is not deemed persuasive to overcome the above rejection for several reasons.

First, the closest prior art of record, Lang's Example q, was not compared. Lang's composition contains a mixture of oxidation bases and couplers, encompassed

by the claims but not present in the compared compositions. It is unclear how these additional dyes effect the overall results. Showings of unexpected results must compare the closest prior art. See Ex parte Beck, 9 USPQ 2d 2000 (BPAI 1987); In re Burkel, 201 USPQ 67 (CCPA 1979), and In re Merchant, 197 USPQ 785 (CCPA 1976).

Second, the evidence is not commensurate in scope with the claims. Particularly, the claims allow for countless mixtures of dyes of formula (I) in combination with any oxidation base and a coupler of formula (II), wherein each component may be present in virtually any amount at any pH. Two combinations as claimed were compared, wherein both combinations contained the same oxidation base and coupler, i.e. p-phenylenediamine and 2-methyl-5-aminophenol. Such a limited showing is not representative of the full scope of the claimed invention. Evidence of unobviousness must be commensurate in scope with the claims. See In re Kulling, 14 USPQ 2d 1056, 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the appeal brief have been fully considered but they are not persuasive regarding the above rejection.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the references.

Adequate motivation to combine the references is supplied by Konrad, column 2 (see above) who teaches the substituted m-aminophenol as an improvement over m-aminophenol. The purpose of Konrad's invention to an improved coupler, that is an improved m-aminophenol, making the substitution prima facie obvious.

Applicant argues that there is no objective teaching to combine Konrad's substituted m-aminophenol with the direct dye of Lang in example q. However, Applicant is not adding a component but is replacing the m-aminophenol in example q with the m-aminophenol which has been invented by Konrad as an improvement over m-aminophenol. Applicant argues that Konrad does not teach nor suggest the substitution of the coupler of formula I for m-aminophenol for use in compositions comprising both an oxidation base and a direct dye. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Konrad need not show or teach or suggest the substitution of the coupler of formula 1 for m-aminophenol because Lang is applied for the teaching that meta-aminophenol and applicant's direct dyes are used in combination. Thus all of the dyes are used in compositions for dyeing hair. It is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. See *In re Kerkhoven*, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072. Applicant next argues that there is no teaching to use Konrad's coupler in a composition comprising all 14 components in example q of Lang. Applicant is directed to his own specification, pages 27 and 28 which reveals that most of the components are part of the "common dye support" used with any combination of dyes. Regarding the arguments that Kerkhoven is not applicable, applicant states that the components of the composition polymerize

and therefore are reactive components, not static components. The direct dye is not a reactive component , and does not take part in the oxidative polymerization.

Accordingly that argument is not applicable. The direct cationic dyes are known additives to oxidation dyeing compositions to provide added glints and shades. They do not react with the bases and couplers.

Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang and Konrad as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Rondeau et al., US 6,001,135.

Lang and Konrad are applied as in the above rejection as rendering obvious the composition as claimed in claim 26 wherein a cationic direct dye is combined with an oxidation base and a substituted m-aminophenol coupler. However, there is no mention in either reference of using a double base as claimed in claim 37 as the oxidation base.

Rondeau is applied for teaching the equivalence of the double bases as claimed in claim 37 to the oxidation bases used in Lang when used in compositions containing cationic direct dyes. See the disclosure of Rondeau beginning on col 7 line 65 and continuing through column 9 for the oxidation bases and columns 11 et seq for the direct dyes. Note in particular dye 130 in col 14 which is an isomer of the pyridoneazo dye as taught by Konrad.—Accordingly it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use a double base as the oxidation base in the composition of Lang because Rondeau teaches their equivalence for use as oxidation bases in oxidative hair dyeing compositions comprising a cationic direct dye.

Claims 26-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rondeau et al., US 5,919,273. Rondeau teaches and claims compositions, processes and kits for dyeing keratin fibers, in particular, hair, comprising an oxidation base, a substituted meta-aminophenol and a cationic direct dye. The oxidation base includes all claimed herein (see claims 9-11), the substituted meta-aminophenol includes those claimed herein (see claims 7 and 18), and the cationic dyes include a pyridineazo, dye II-30, which is a position isomer of the dyes claimed in this application (see column 29, claim 19). Note also Structure A₄ in col 3 which is a general teaching of the pyridine component. The process of dyeing keratin fibers is claimed in claim 39 and the kit analogous to the one claimed in instant claim 60 is claimed in claim 43.

It would have been obvious to the man having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to formulate a composition for dyeing keratin hair containing the direct dyes as claimed with the substituted aminophenol coupler as claimed and oxidation base as claimed because Rondeau et al. teaches compositions, processes and kits which includes a position isomer of applicant's claimed dye. Note that structurally similar compounds are generally expected to have similar properties. In re Gyurik, 596 F. 2d 1012, 201 USPQ 552. Closely related homologs, analogs and isomers in chemistry may create a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Dillon USPQ 2d 1897, 1904 (Fed. Cir. 1990); In re Payne 203 USPQ 245 (CCPA 1979); In re Mills 126 USPQ 513 (CCPA 1960); In re Henze 85 USPQ 261 (CCPA 1950); In re Hass 60 USPQ 544 (CCPA 1944).

Claims 26-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 5,919,273. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are directed to compositions, process and kits containing all of the elements of the compositions, process and kits as claimed herein except that the claimed dye includes a position isomer of the dyes in the compositions, processes and kits claimed in the patent. See analysis in the above rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret Einsmann whose telephone number is (703) 308-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. The fax phone number for this Technology Center is (703) 305-3599

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 09/424,116
Art Unit: 1751

Page 10

Margaret Einsmann
MARGARET EINSMANN

PRIMARY EXAMINER 1751

July 25, 2002